Gauge symmetry and constraints structure in topologically massive AdS gravity: A symplectic viewpoint

Omar Rodríguez-Tzompantzi*
Facultad de Ciencias Físico Matemáticas,
Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla,
Apartado postal 1152, 72001 Puebla, Pue., México.

Alberto Escalante†
Instituto de Física, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla,
Apartado Postal J-48 72570, Puebla Pue., México,

(Dated: February 21, 2017)

By applying the Faddeev-Jackiw symplectic approach we systematically show that both the local gauge symmetry and the constraint structure of topologically massive gravity with a cosmological constant Λ, elegantly encoded in the zero-modes of the symplectic matrix, can be identified. Thereafter, via an appropriate partial gauge-fixing procedure, the time gauge, we calculate the quantization bracket structure (generalized Faddeev-Jackiw brackets) for the dynamic variables and confirm that the number of physical degrees of freedom is one. This approach provides an alternative to explore the dynamical content of massive gravity models.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k,98.80.Cq

arXiv:1702.05540v1 [hep-th] 17 Feb 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Fundamental issues in modern cosmology such as inflation, dark matter and dark energy [1, 2], which attempt to explain the primordial and late time accelerating expansion of our universe, have long been a motivation to alternative gravity theories beyond original Einstein's General Relativity, both in the ultraviolet (UV) and the infrared (IR) regimes. Because of Lovelock's theorem [3, 4] any modification of General Relativity requires the inclusion of at least one of the following ingredients: (i) extra dimensions, (ii) extra degrees of freedom, (iii) higher-derivatives terms, and (iv) non-locality. Massive gravity theories are an example of the type (iii) (even massive gravity has extra degrees of freedom), in which the massless graviton of General Relativity is given a nonzero mass (see e.g. [5–14]). This type of theories is known to be non-unitary owing to the presence of an additional unstable degree of freedom, known as the Boulware-Deser ghost [15–17]. However, it is renormalizable, which is a crucial step towards quantization, and therefore this implies superrenormalizability in three dimensions [18–20]. In the study of several topics of General Relativity such as

*Electronic address: omarrtz@alumnos.fcfm.buap.mx, omar.tz2701@gmail.com
†Electronic address: aescalan@ifuap.buap.mx

massive gravity, it is always useful to consider toy models that share the conceptual foundations of the four dimensional theories, but are free of many technical difficulties. This is particularly true in three-dimensional (3D) gravity. In this work we will focus on studying the simplest 3D version of a massive gravity theory.

In particular, to make 3D Einstein gravity more realistic, in comparison with higher dimensions, in the sense of having local propagating modes, one can modify the theory by including certain higher-derivative curvature terms in the Einstein-Hilbert (EH) action, which leads to the simplest 3D massive gravity theory known as Topologically Massive Gravity(TMG). This theory consists of an EH term, with or without a consmological constant Λ, plus a parity-violating gravitational Chern-Simons (CS) term with coefficient $\frac{1}{\mu}$ [21–24]. At the linear level, this theory describes a single massive state of helicity +2 or -2 (depending on the relative sign between the EH and CS terms) in AdS background [25] and defines an unitary irreducible representation of the 3D Poincaré group [26].

However, while a linearized analysis usually allows a reliable counting of the physical degrees of freedom, there are cases in which it can yield misleading results. A Lagrangian/Hamiltonian formulation should provide a way to count the number of local physical degrees of freedom without resorting to linearization, that is, taking into account all physical constraints and gauge invariance (i.e. gauge-independence). In this sense, the identification of the physical degrees of freedom can be addressed by a direct application of Dirac's method for constrained Hamiltonian systems [27], which systematically separates all the constraints into first-and second-class ones [28, 29]. As a consequence, the physical degree of freedom can be separated from the gauge degrees of freedom, and a generator of the gauge symmetry can be constructed as a suitable combination of first-class constraints [30]. Furthermore, the bracket structure (Dirac's brackets) to quantize a gauge system can be obtained by getting rid of the second-class constraints. In the case of the massive gravity theories, however, the separation between first-and second-class constraints is a delicate issue, and the system considered along this paper is not an exception [31–34]. Particularly, in Ref. [31] the Hamiltonian structure of TMG was further analyzed by using Dirac's formalism. Indeed, these authors have obtained the secondary first-class constraints structure of this model with the help of the theorem: *"If ϕ is a first-class constraint, then $\{\phi, H^T\}$ is also a first-class constraint"*. Nevertheless, this treatment is quite involved and unsatisfactory. On the other hand, the authors of Refs. [33, 34] present a fully Lagrangian analysis, but to have a theory with the right number of physical degrees of freedom in configuration space, one extra constraint on the basic variables must be imposed by hand. This is the main difficulty and it thus would be interesting if one could systematically obtain all the desired constraints from an appropriate Lagrangian formulation. For these reasons, the analysis of the nature of constraints and the gauge symmetry for massive gravity models, which is still missing in the literature, can be quite important and it is mandatory to carry out the analysis for quantize the theory.

Interestingly, as an alternative to Dirac's method, Faddeev and Jackiw [35] proposed an approach, which is well motivated geometrically and it is based on the symplectic structure for constrained

systems for obtaining in an elegant way several essential elements of a particular physical theory, such as the physical constraints, the local gauge symmetry, the quantization bracket structure and the number of physical degrees of freedom: The so-called Faddeev-Jackiw (F-J) symplectic formalism (for a detailed account of the F-J procedure see [36–43]). It turns out that such an approach does not require to classify the constraints into first-and second-class ones and does not requires Dirac's conjetura. Furthermore, the quantization brackets can be identified as the elements of the inverse matrix of the symplectic one. For a gauge system, the symplectic matrix remains singular unless a gauge-fixing procedure is introduced. In addition, the generators of the gauge symmetries are given in terms of the zero-modes of the symplectic matrix. In this respect, the F-J symplectic method provides an effective tool for dealing with gauge theories.

The purpose of this article is to present a detailed F-J analysis of three-dimensional topologically massive AdS gravity in a completely different context to that presented in Refs. [31–34]. More precisely, we will study the nature of the physical constraints and we will obtain the gauge symmetry, as well as its generators, under which all physical quantities must be invariant. Subsequently, we will obtain both the fundamental quantization brackets and the number of physical degrees of freedom by introducing an appropriate gauge-fixing procedure.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In the section II we briefly review the topologically massive AdS gravity action. In section III, we explore the nature of the constraints within the Faddeev-Jackiw symplectic framework and we derive the corresponding symplectic matrix. The full set of physical constraints of the theory are obtained. In Section IV, the gauge symmetry and its generators are obtained via the zero-modes of the symplectic matrix. In Section V we introduce gauge-fixing conditions in order to obtain both the quantization bracket structure and the number of physical degrees of freedom. We conclude with a brief discussion of our results in Section VI.

II. ACTION AND EQUATIONS OF MOTION OF TOPOLOGICALLY MASSIVE GRAVITY

Our starting point is the action of topologically massive AdS gravity written in the first-order formalism:

$$S[A,e,\lambda]=\int_{\mathcal{M}}\left[2\theta e^{i}\wedge F[A]_{i}-\frac{1}{3}\Lambda f_{ijk}e^{i}\wedge e^{j}\wedge e^{k}+\lambda^{i}\wedge T_{i}+\frac{\theta}{\mu}A^{i}\wedge\left(dA_{i}+\frac{1}{3}f_{ijk}A^{j}\wedge A^{k}\right)\right], \tag{1}$$

where μ is the Chern-Simons parameter, $\theta=1/16\pi G$ with G the 3D Newton's constant, and Λ is a cosmological constant such that $\Lambda=-1/l^{2}$, where l is the AdS radius [25]. Furthermore, the fundamental fields of this action are: the dreibein 1-form $e^{i}=e^{i}_{\mu}dx^{\mu}$ which determines a space-time metric via $g_{\mu\nu}=e_{\mu}{}^{i}e_{\nu}{}^{j}\eta_{ij}$; the auxiliary field 1-form λ^{i} that ensures that the torsion vanishes $T_{i}=0$ [44, 45]; and the dualised spin-connection $A^{i}=A_{\mu}{}^{i}dx^{\mu}$ valued on the adjoint representation of the Lie group $SO(2,2)$, so that, it admits an invariant totally anti-symmetric tensor f_{ijk}. The

connection acts on internal indices and defines a derivative operator:

$$D_\mu V^i \equiv \partial_\mu V^i + f^i{}_{jk} A_\mu{}^j V^k, \tag{2}$$

where ∂ is a fiducial derivative operator. Finally, T_i is the local Lorentz covariant torsion 2-form, whereas F_i is the curvature 2-form of the spin connection A^i, whose explicit expression reads

$$T_i \equiv de_i + f_{ijk} A^j \wedge e^k, \qquad F_i \equiv dA_i + \frac{1}{2} f_{ijk} A^j \wedge A^k. \tag{3}$$

The convention adopted is the standard one, that is, the Greek indices $\mu, \nu, \alpha, ...$ refer to spacetime coordinates while the Latin letters $i, j, k, ...$ correspond to Lorentz indices. The equations of motion that can be extracted by varying the action (1) with respect to e^i, A^i and λ^i, respectively, in addition to some total derivative terms, are given by

$$(\delta e)^{\alpha i} = \epsilon^{\alpha\nu\rho} \left(2\theta F_{\nu\rho}{}^i + D_\nu \lambda_\rho{}^i - \Lambda f^i{}_{jk} e_\nu{}^j e_\rho{}^k \right) = 0, \tag{4}$$

$$(\delta A)^{\alpha i} = \epsilon^{\alpha\nu\rho} \left(2\theta T_{\nu\rho}{}^i + f^i{}_{jk} \lambda_\nu{}^j e_\rho{}^k + 2\theta\mu^{-1} F_{\nu\rho}{}^i \right) = 0, \tag{5}$$

$$(\delta\lambda)^{\alpha i} = \epsilon^{\alpha\nu\rho} T_{\nu\rho}{}^i = 0, \tag{6}$$

one can note that the Eq. (6) is the condition for the compatibility of $A_\mu{}^i$ and $e_\mu{}^i$, which implies

$$A_\mu{}^{ij} = -e^{\nu j} \partial_\mu e_\nu{}^i + \Gamma^\beta_{\alpha\mu} e^i_\beta e^{\alpha j}, \tag{7}$$

with $\Gamma^\beta_{\alpha\mu}$ the Christoffel symbols of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Moreover, by inserting Eq. (6) into Eq. (5), one can solve for the Lagrangian multiplier $\lambda_\mu{}^i$ in terms of the 3D Schouten tensor of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\lambda_\mu{}^i = 2\theta\mu^{-2} S_{\mu\nu} e^{i\nu} \qquad \text{with} \qquad S_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} R. \tag{8}$$

After plugging the results into Eq. (4) and a lenghty calculation, one can find the field equation of TMG [21] in the second-order formalism as follows:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{\mu} C_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{9}$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the cosmological-constant-modified Einstein tensor defined as

$$G_{\mu\nu} \equiv R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}, \tag{10}$$

and $C_{\mu\nu}$ is the symmetric traceless Cotton tensor given by

$$C_{\mu\nu} \equiv \epsilon_\mu{}^{\alpha\beta} \nabla_\alpha \left(R_{\beta\nu} - \frac{1}{4} g_{\beta\nu} R \right), \tag{11}$$

here ∇ is the covariant derivative defined with Γ. Considering small perturbations around an anti-de Sitter background, the theory describes the existence of a single massive graviton mode [21, 25, 26]. However, from a theoretical point of view, it is better to check the validity of such rough arguments by a careful Hamiltonian or Lagrangian analysis at nonlinear order.

III. THE NATURE OF CONSTRAINTS IN THE FADDEEV-JACKIW SYMPLECTIC FRAMEWORK

In order to apply Faddeev-Jackiw's symplectic approach [35], throughout this work we will take the spacetime $\mathcal{M}$ to be globally hyperbolic such that it may be foliated as $\mathcal{M} \simeq \Sigma \times \Re$, where Σ corresponds to a Cauchy's surface without boundary ($\partial\Sigma = 0$) and $\Re$ represents an evolution parameter. By performing a $2+1$ splitting of our fields without breaking the internal symmetry, the TMG action (1) acquires the form,

$$\begin{aligned} S[A,e,\lambda] \;=\; & \int \left[\epsilon^{ab}\theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu}A_{bi}+2e_{bi}\right)\dot{A}^{i}{}_{a}+\epsilon^{ab}\lambda_{ib}\dot{e}^{i}{}_{a}+\epsilon^{ab}e^{i}{}_{0}\left(\theta F_{abi}+D_{a}\lambda_{bi}-\Lambda f_{ijk}e_{a}{}^{j}e_{b}{}^{k}\right)\right. \\ & \left.+\epsilon^{ab}A^{i}{}_{0}\left(\theta T_{abi}+\frac{1}{\mu}\theta F_{abi}+f_{ijk}\lambda^{j}{}_{a}e^{k}{}_{b}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ab}\lambda^{i}{}_{0}T_{abi}\right]d^{3}x, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

up to a boundary term. Here $F_{ab}{}^{i} = \partial_a A^i_b - \partial_b A^i_a + f^{i}{}_{jk}A_a{}^{j}A_b{}^{k}$ is the field strength of $A_a{}^{i}$, $T_{ab}{}^{i} = D_a e_b{}^{i} - D_b e_a{}^{i}$ and $D_a\lambda_b{}^{i} = \partial_a\lambda_b{}^{i} + f^{i}{}_{ij}A_a{}^{j}\lambda_b{}^{k}$. Besides $a, b, c, ...$ are space coordinate and the dot denotes a derivative with respect to the evolution parameter. We can read off the Lagrangian density from (12) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(0)} \;=\; & \epsilon^{ab}\theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu}A_{bi}+2e_{bi}\right)\dot{A}^{i}{}_{a}+\epsilon^{ab}\lambda_{ib}\dot{e}^{i}{}_{a}+\epsilon^{ab}e^{i}{}_{0}(\theta F_{abi}+D_{a}\lambda_{bi}-\Lambda f_{ijk}e_{a}{}^{j}e_{b}{}^{k})+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ab}\lambda^{i}{}_{0}T_{abi} \\ & +\epsilon^{ab}A^{i}{}_{0}\left(\theta T_{abi}+\frac{1}{\mu}\theta F_{abi}+f_{ijk}\lambda^{j}{}_{a}e^{k}{}_{b}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

In particular, this Lagrangian density can be expressed compactly as

$$\mathcal{L}^{(0)} = a^{(0)}_{I}\dot{\xi}^{(0)I} - V^{(0)}, \tag{14}$$

by introducing an initial set of symplectic variable given by

$$\xi^{(0)I} = (A^{i}{}_{a}, A^{i}{}_{0}, e^{i}{}_{a}, e^{i}{}_{0}, \lambda^{i}{}_{a}, \lambda^{i}{}_{0}), \tag{15}$$

which allows us to identify the corresponding symplectic one-form

$$a^{(0)}{}_{I} = (\epsilon^{ab}\theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu}A_{bi}+2e_{bi}\right), 0, \epsilon^{ab}\lambda_{bi}, 0, 0, 0), \tag{16}$$

whereas the symplectic potential reads as

$$V^{(0)} = -\epsilon^{ab}e^{i}{}_{0}(\theta F_{abi}+D_{a}\lambda_{bi}-\Lambda f_{ijk}e_{a}{}^{j}e_{b}{}^{k}) - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ab}\lambda^{i}{}_{0}T_{abi} - \epsilon^{ab}A^{i}{}_{0}\left(\theta T_{abi}+\frac{1}{\mu}\theta F_{abi}+f_{ijk}\lambda^{j}{}_{a}e^{k}{}_{b}\right). \tag{17}$$

On the other hand, the corresponding equations of motion arising from the above Lagrangian (14) can be written as

$$f^{(0)}_{IJ}\dot{\xi}^{(0)J} - \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^{(0)I}}V(\xi)^{(0)} = 0, \tag{18}$$

with $f^{(0)}_{IJ} \equiv \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^{(0)I}}a^{(0)}_{J} - \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^{(0)J}}a^{(0)}_{I}$ the two-form symplectic matrix associated to $\mathcal{L}^{(0)}$, which is clearly antisymmetric. By using the symplectic variables (15) and (16), we find that the corresponding

symplectic matrix $f^{(0)}_{IJ}(x,y)$ can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\epsilon^{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & -2\theta\epsilon^{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2\theta\epsilon^{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\epsilon^{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon^{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \delta^2(x-y). \tag{19}$$

It is not difficult to see that the matrix $f^{(0)}_{IJ}$ is degenerate in the sense that there are more degrees of freedom in the equations of motion (18) than physical degrees of freedom in the theory. In this case, there are constraints that must remove the unphysical degrees of freedom. The constraints appear in this formalism as algebraic relations necessary to maintain the consistency of the equations of motion. Moreover, it is straightforward to determine that the zero-modes of the singular matrix (19) are $(v^{(0)}_1)^I = (0, v^{A^i{}_0}, 0, 0, 0, 0)$, $(v^{(0)}_2)^I = (0, 0, 0, v^{e^i{}_0}, 0, 0)$ and $(v^{(0)}_3)^I = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, v^{\lambda^i{}_0})$, with non-vanishing arbitrary components $v^{A^i{}_0}$, $v^{e^i{}_0}$ and $v^{\lambda^i{}_0}$, respectively.

The zero-modes satisfy the equation $(v^{(0)}_{1,2,3})^I f^{(0)}_{IJ} = 0$, therefore from the equation of motion (18), we have the following constraint relations:

$$\int dx^2 (v^{(0)}_1)^T_J \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^J} \int dy^2 V^{(0)} = v^{A^i_0}\left(\theta\epsilon^{ab}T_{abi} + \frac{\theta}{\mu}\epsilon^{ab}F_{abi} + \epsilon^{ab}f_{ijk}\lambda^j{}_a e^k{}_b\right) = 0, \tag{20}$$

$$\int dx^2 (v^{(0)}_2)^T_J \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^J} \int dy^2 V^{(0)} = v^{e^i_0}\left(\theta\epsilon^{ab}F_{abi} + \epsilon^{ab}D_a\lambda_{bi} - \Lambda\epsilon^{ab}f_{ijk}e_a{}^j e_b{}^k\right) = 0, \tag{21}$$

$$\int dx^2 (v^{(0)}_3)^T_J \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^J} \int dy^2 V^{(0)} = v^{\lambda^i_0}\left(\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ab}T_{abi}\right) = 0, \tag{22}$$

since $v^{A^i_0}$, $v^{e^i_0}$ and $v^{\lambda^i_0}$ are arbitrary functions. The constraints become

$$\Xi^{(0)}_i = \theta\epsilon^{ab}T_{abi} + \frac{\theta}{\mu}\epsilon^{ab}F_{abi} + \epsilon^{ab}f_{ijk}\lambda^j{}_a e^k{}_b = 0, \tag{23}$$

$$\Theta^{(0)}_i = \theta\epsilon^{ab}F_{abi} + \epsilon^{ab}D_a\lambda_{bi} - \Lambda\epsilon^{ab}f_{ijk}e_a{}^j e_b{}^k = 0, \tag{24}$$

$$\Sigma^{(0)}_i = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ab}T_{abi} = 0. \tag{25}$$

Now, according to the methodology of the symplectic framework, we will analyze whether there are new constraints. To achieve this, we demand stability (consistency condition) of the constraints (23), (24) and (25), which guarantees their time-independence. Since Ξ_i, Θ_i and Σ_i depend only on the set of symplectic variables $\xi^{(0)I}$, the consistency condition can be written as

$$\dot{\Omega}^{(0)} = \frac{\delta\Omega^{(0)}}{\delta\xi^{(0)I}}\dot{\xi}^{(0)I} = 0 \qquad \text{with} \qquad \Omega^{(0)} = \Xi^{(0)}_i, \Theta^{(0)}_i, \Sigma^{(0)}_i. \tag{26}$$

Therefore the consistency of the constraints $\Omega^{(0)}$, together with the equations of motion (18) can be generally rewritten as

$$f^{(1)}_{KJ}\dot{\xi}^{(0)J} = Z^{(1)}_K(\xi), \tag{27}$$

with

$$f^{(1)}_{KJ}=\begin{pmatrix} f^{(0)}_{IJ} \\ \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^{(0)I}}\Omega^{(0)} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Z^{(1)}_{K}=\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^{(0)I}}V^{(0)} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{28}$$

Furthermore, the new matrix $f^{(1)}_{KJ}$ can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\eta_{ij} & 0 & -2\theta\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2\theta\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\eta_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2\frac{\theta}{\mu}(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a - \mu f_{ijk}e^k{}_a) & 0 & 2\theta(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a - \frac{1}{2\theta}f_{ijk}\lambda^k{}_a) & 0 & -f_{ijk}e^k{}_a & 0 \\ 2\theta(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a - \frac{1}{2\theta}f_{ijk}\lambda^k{}_a) & 0 & 2\Lambda f_{ijk}e_a{}^k & 0 & (\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a) & 0 \\ -f_{ijk}e^k{}_a & 0 & \left(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a\right) & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\times\epsilon^{ab}\delta^2(x-y). \tag{29}$$

It is clear that $f^{(1)}_{KJ}$ is not a square matrix, however, it has linearly independent zero-modes, which turn out to be

$$(v^{(1)}_1)^K = \left(-\partial_a\eta^j_m - f^j{}_{lm}A^l{}_a, 0, -f^j{}_{lm}e^l{}_a, 0, -f^j{}_{lm}\lambda_a{}^l, 0, \eta^j_m, 0, 0\right), \tag{30}$$

$$(v^{(1)}_2)^K = \left(-\frac{\mu}{2\theta}f^j{}_{lm}\lambda^l{}_a, 0, -\partial_a\eta^j_m - f^j{}_{lm}A^l{}_a, 0, f^j{}_{lm}\left(\mu\lambda^l{}_a + 2\Lambda e^l{}_a\right), 0, 0, \eta^j_m, 0\right), \tag{31}$$

$$(v^{(1)}_3)^K = \left(-\frac{\mu}{2\theta}f^j{}_{lm}e^l{}_a, 0, 0, 0, -\partial_a\eta^j_m - f^j{}_{lm}A^l{}_a + \mu f^j{}_{lm}e^l{}_a, 0, 0, 0, \eta^j_m\right), \tag{32}$$

such that $(v^{(1)}_{1,2,3})^K f^{(1)}_{KJ}=0$. By using the symplectic potential, we find that the matrix $Z^{(1)}_K$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} -2\theta\left(D_a e_{0j} + \frac{1}{\mu}D_a A_{0j}\right) + f_{jlm}\left(e_0{}^l\lambda_a{}^m + (\,\lambda_0{}^l + 2\theta A_0{}^l\,)e_a{}^m\right) \\ \Xi^{(0)}_i \\ -D_a\lambda_{0j} - 2\theta D_a A_{0j} + f_{jlm}A^l{}_0\lambda^m{}_a - 2\Lambda f_{jlm}e^l{}_0 e^m{}_a \\ \Theta^{(0)}_i \\ -D_a e_{0j} + f_{jlm}A^l{}_0 e^m{}_a \\ \Sigma^{(0)}_i \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \epsilon^{ab}\delta^2(x-y). \tag{33}$$

By multiplying both sides of Eq.(27) by the zero-modes of the matrix $f^{(1)}_{KJ}$, and evaluating at $\Omega^{(0)}=0$, we get the following covariant constraint relations (the integration symbols $\int$ is omitted

for simplicity):

$$(v_1^{(1)})^K Z_K^{(1)} \mid_{\Omega^{(0)}=0} = 0, \tag{34}$$

$$(v_2^{(1)})^K Z_K^{(1)} \mid_{\Omega^{(0)}=0} = -\frac{1}{2\theta}\mu\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}\lambda_{\alpha i}e_\beta{}^j\lambda_{\gamma j}, \tag{35}$$

$$(v_3^{(1)})^K Z_K^{(1)} \mid_{\Omega^{(0)}=0} = \frac{1}{2\theta}\mu\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}e_{\alpha i}e_\beta{}^j\lambda_{\gamma j}. \tag{36}$$

The substitution $\Omega^{(0)} = 0$ guarantees that these constraints will drop from the remainder of the calculation. Then, from (35) and (36), together with invertibility of $e_{\alpha i}$ and $\lambda_{\alpha i}$, we finally obtain

$$\Phi^\alpha = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}e_\beta{}^j\lambda_{\gamma j} = 0, \tag{37}$$

which are known as symmetry conditions [12] and play a crucial role in the relation of the metric and tetrad formulations of massive gravity theories and multi-bigravity ones. Furthermore, one finds that the equation (37) can be split into two equations:

$$\Phi^a = \epsilon^{ab}\left(e^i{}_0\lambda_{ib} - e^i{}_b\lambda_{i0}\right) = 0, \tag{38}$$

$$\Phi^0 = \epsilon^{ab}e^i{}_a\lambda_{ib} = 0, \tag{39}$$

from where we can see that the Eq. (38) has fixed fields e_0^i and λ_0^i, whereas Eq. (39) gives us one more constraint. This agrees completely with what was found in [31] by means of the Dirac procedure, however, in the Dirac formalism the constraints (38) and (39) arise as tertiary constraints, whereas in [33, 34] the constraint (39) has been introduced by hand. Now, by imposing the stability condition on the new constraint (39), we have the following equation:

$$f_{KJ}^{(2)}\dot{\xi}^{(0)J} = Z_K^{(2)}(\xi), \tag{40}$$

where now the matrices $f_{KJ}^{(2)}$ and $Z_K^{(1)}$ can be expressed as

$$f_{KJ}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} f_{IJ}^{(1)} \\ \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^{(0)I}}\Phi^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_K^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} Z_K^{(1)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{41}$$

Consequently, the new matrix $f_{IJ}^{(2)}$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix}
2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\eta_{ij} & 0 & -2\theta\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2\theta\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\eta_{ij} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2\frac{\theta}{\mu}(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a - \mu f_{ijk}e^k{}_a) & 0 & 2\theta(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a - \frac{1}{2\theta}f_{ijk}\lambda^k{}_a) & 0 & -f_{ijk}e^k{}_a & 0 \\
2\theta(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a - \frac{1}{2\theta}f_{ijk}\lambda^k{}_a) & 0 & 2\Lambda f_{ijk}e_a{}^k & 0 & (\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a) & 0 \\
-f_{ijk}e^k{}_a & 0 & \left(\eta_{ij}\partial_a - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a\right) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \lambda_{aj} & 0 & e_{aj} & 0
\end{pmatrix}$$

$$\times\epsilon^{ab}\delta^2(x-y), \tag{42}$$

one easily verifies that $f^{(2)}_{IJ}$ is also a singular matrix. Moreover, it now has the following linearly independent zero-modes:

$$(v^{(2)}_1)^J = \left(-\partial_a\eta^j_m - f^j{}_{lm}A^l{}_a, 0, -f^j{}_{lm}e^l{}_a, 0, -f^j{}_{lm}\lambda_a{}^l, 0, \eta^j_m, 0, 0, 0\right), \tag{43}$$

$$(v^{(2)}_2)^J = \left(-\frac{\mu}{2\theta}f^j{}_{lm}\lambda^l{}_a, 0, -\partial_a\eta^j_m - f^j{}_{lm}A^l{}_a, 0, f^j{}_{lm}\left(\mu\lambda^l{}_a + 2\Lambda e^l{}_a\right), 0, 0, \eta^j_m, 0, 0\right), \tag{44}$$

$$(v^{(2)}_3)^J = \left(-\frac{\mu}{2\theta}f^j{}_{lm}e^l{}_a, 0, 0, 0, -\partial_a\eta^j_m - f^j{}_{lm}A^l{}_a + \mu f^j{}_{lm}e^l{}_a, 0, 0, 0, \eta^j_m, 0\right), \tag{45}$$

$$(v^{(2)}_4)^J = \left(\mu e_a{}^j, 0, e_a{}^j, 0, -\left(\lambda_a{}^j + 2\theta\mu e_a{}^j\right), 0, 0, 0, 0, \eta^j_m\right). \tag{46}$$

After performing the contraction of the two sides of (40) with the new zero-modes, it is not difficult to see that the zero-modes (43), (44) and (45) do not generate any new constraint, whereas from the zero-mode $(v^{(2)}_4)^J$ we have the following constraint relation:

$$(v^{(2)}_4)^K Z^{(2)}_K \mid_{\Omega^{(0)},\Omega^{(1)}=0} = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\nu}f_{ijk}e^i_\alpha e^j_\beta\left(\Lambda e^k_\nu + \mu\lambda^k_\nu\right) = -2\mathbf{e}\left(3\Lambda + \mu\lambda\right) = 0, \tag{47}$$

where we have used $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\nu}e_\alpha{}^i e_\beta{}^j e_\nu{}^k = \mathbf{e}f^{ijk}$ with $\mathbf{e} = \det \mid e_\alpha{}^i \mid$ and $\lambda = e_\alpha{}^i\lambda^\alpha{}_i$. Hence, from Eq. (47) we can identify the following scalar constraint:

$$\Upsilon = 3\Lambda + \mu\lambda = 0, \tag{48}$$

this is also in agreement with what was obtained in Ref. [31] via the Dirac procedure, whereas in [33, 34] this constraint is missing. Once again, we can introduce the consistency condition on (48) and explore whether there are further constraints in the theory. To this aim, we study the equation

$$f^{(3)}_{KJ}\dot{\xi}^{(0)J} = Z^{(3)}_K(\xi). \tag{49}$$

It is easy to check that even after inserting the above constraint into the matrix $f^{(3)}_{KJ}$ and calculating its zero-modes, no new constraint is obtained. Hence, there are no further constraints in the theory and thus our procedure to obtain new constraints via the consistency condition is done. With the above results and the F-J method, we can now introduce the constraints (23), (24), (25), (39) and (48) into the Lagrangian density (13) by means of the corresponding Lagrangian multipliers in order to construct a new one. So, the new symplectic Lagrangian can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \epsilon^{ab}\theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu}A_{bi} + 2e_{bi}\right)\dot{A}^i{}_a + \epsilon^{ab}\lambda_{ib}\dot{e}^i{}_a - \Xi_i\dot{\beta}^i - \Theta_i\dot{\alpha}^i - \Sigma_i\dot{\gamma}^i - \Phi^0\dot{\varphi}_0 - \Upsilon\dot{\varphi} - V, \tag{50}$$

with $\dot{\alpha}^i$, $\dot{\beta}^i$, $\dot{\gamma}^i$, $\dot{\varphi}_0$ and $\dot{\varphi}$ the Lagrangian multipliers relative to the obtained constraints. Furthermore, one can note that the symplectic potential vanishes on the constraint surface since it turns out to be a linear combination of constraints reflecting the general covariance of the theory; that is, $V = V^{(0)} \mid_{\Omega^{(0)},\Omega^{(1)},\Phi^0,\Upsilon=0} = 0$. Moreover, from the Lagrangian density (50), the new symplectic variable set is taken as

$$\xi^I = \left(A^i{}_a, \beta^i, e^i{}_a, \alpha^i, \lambda^i{}_a, \gamma^i, \varphi^0, \varphi\right), \tag{51}$$

whose corresponding canonical 1-form is given by

$$a_I = \left(\epsilon^{ab}\theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu}A_{bi} + 2e_{bi}\right), -\Xi_i, \epsilon^{ab}\lambda_{bi}, -\Theta_i, 0, -\Sigma_i, -\Phi_0, -\Upsilon\right). \tag{52}$$

Next, we can use the symplectic variables (51) and (52) to construct the corresponding square symplectic matrix $f_{IJ} \equiv \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^I} a_J - \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi^J} a_I$, which turns out to be

$$\begin{pmatrix}
2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\eta_{ij} & -2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\nabla_{aij} & -2\theta\eta_{ij} & -2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & E_{aij} & 0 & 0 \\
2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\nabla_{aij} & 0 & 2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & -E_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2\theta\eta_{ij} & -2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & -2\Lambda E_{aij} & -\eta_{ij} & -D^x_{aij} & -\lambda_{aj} & -\mu\epsilon_{ad}\lambda^d{}_j \\
2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & 2\Lambda E_{aij} & 0 & D^y_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & E_{aij} & \eta_{ij} & -D^x_{aij} & 0 & 0 & -e_{aj} & -\mu\epsilon_{ad}e^d{}_j \\
-E_{aij} & 0 & D^y_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \lambda_{aj} & 0 & e_{aj} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \mu\epsilon_{ad}\lambda^d{}_j & 0 & \mu\epsilon_{ad}e^d{}_j & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} \epsilon^{ab}\delta^2(x-y). \quad (53)$$

Here, we have defined $\nabla_{aij} = (D_{aij} - \mu E_{aij})$ and $\triangle_{aij} = \left(D_{aij} - \frac{1}{2\theta}L_{aij}\right)$ with $D_{aij} = \partial_a\eta_{ij} - f_{ijk}A^k{}_a$, $E_{aij} = f_{ijk}e^k{}_a$ and $L_{aij} = f_{ijk}\lambda^k{}_a$ respectively. It is worth noting that the symplectic matrix f_{IJ} remains singular on the constrained surface, and therefore it still has linearly independent zero-modes. Nevertheless, we have shown that no more constraints can be obtained via the consistency conditions. Consequently, the non-invertibility of f_{IJ} is a signal of a gauge symmetry that should be fixed by using additional conditions (gauge conditions) to remove the singularity. In this way the quantization bracket structure can be determined and the procedure can be achieved in terms of the physical degrees of freedom.

IV. GAUGE TRANSFORMATIONS

It is well-know that the concept of gauge symmetry has played a central role in the development of fundamental theories of physical laws. On the other hand, the need to describe the interactions of nature along the lines of a relativistic dynamics led us to build a covariant language with a gauge symmetry [46]. We thus proceed towards the discussion of the gauge symmetry in the symplectic framework. It is worth noting that, when all the constraints have been considered and the symplectic matrix still has zero-modes, but no new constraint can be obtained from the corresponding zero-modes, one can deduce that the theory must have a local gauge symmetry, Therefore the zero-modes act as the generators of the corresponding gauge symmetry 'δ_G', that is, the components of the zero-modes give the transformation properties related to the underlying (gauge) symmetry [37–39]. The local infinitesimal transformations of the symplectic variables generated by $(v)^I$ can be expressed as

$$\delta_G\xi^I = (v_A)^I\,\epsilon^A, \quad (54)$$

where (v_A) are the independent zero-modes of the singular symplectic matrix f_{IJ} and ϵ^A are the gauge parameters. For the singular symplectic matrix (53), these zero-modes turn out to be

$$(v_1)^I = \left(-\partial_a\eta^j{}_k - f^j{}_{lk}A_a{}^l, \eta^j{}_k, -f^j{}_{lk}e^l_a, 0, -f^j{}_{lk}\lambda_a{}^l, 0, 0, 0, 0\right), \quad (55)$$

$$(v_2)^I = \left(-\frac{\mu}{2\theta}f^j{}_{lk}\lambda_a{}^l, 0, -\partial_a\eta^j{}_k - f^j{}_{lk}A_a{}^l, \eta^j{}_k, f^j{}_{lk}\left(\mu\lambda_a{}^l + 2\Lambda e_a{}^l\right), 0, 0, 0, 0\right), \quad (56)$$

$$(v_3)^I = \left(-\frac{\mu}{2\theta}f^j{}_{lk}e_a{}^l, 0, 0, 0, -\partial_a\eta^j{}_k - f^j{}_{lk}A_a{}^l + \mu f^j{}_{lk}e_a{}^l, \eta^j{}_k, 0, 0, 0\right), \quad (57)$$

which are orthogonal to the gradient of the symplectic potential at the same time that generate local displacements on the isopotential surface. As one can see from (54) the infinitesimal gauge transformations that leave the original Lagrangian invariant are given by

$$\delta_G A_\alpha{}^i(x) = -D_\alpha\zeta^i - \frac{\mu}{2\theta} f^i{}_{jk}\left(e_\alpha{}^j\varsigma^k + \lambda_\alpha{}^j\kappa^k\right), \tag{58}$$

$$\delta_G e_\alpha{}^i(x) = -D_\alpha\kappa^i - f^i{}_{jk}e_a^j\zeta^k, \tag{59}$$

$$\delta_G \lambda_\alpha{}^i(x) = -D_\alpha\varsigma^i - f^i{}_{jk}\lambda_\alpha{}^j\zeta^k + \mu f^i{}_{jk}\left(\lambda_a{}^j\kappa^k + e_a{}^j\varsigma^k\right) + 2\Lambda f^i{}_{jk}e_a{}^j\kappa^k, \tag{60}$$

where ζ^i, κ^i and ς^i are the time-dependent gauge parameters. It is worth remarking that (58), (59) and (60) correspond to the fundamental gauge symmetry of the theory, though the diffeomorphisms have not been found yet. However, it is well-known that an appropriate choice of the gauge parameters does generate the diffeomorphism (on-shell) [46, 47, 49]. Let us redefine the gauge parameters as

$$\zeta^i = -A^i{}_\mu\varepsilon^\mu, \qquad \kappa^i = -e^i{}_\mu\varepsilon^\mu, \qquad \varsigma^i = -\lambda^i{}_\mu\varepsilon^\mu, \tag{61}$$

with ε^μ an arbitrary three-vector. Hence, from the fundamental gauge symmetry (60) and the mapping (61), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_G A_\alpha{}^i &= \mathfrak{L}_\varepsilon A_\alpha{}^i + \mu\varepsilon^\mu\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu}\left[\frac{1}{2\theta}\left(\delta A\right)^{\nu i} + \left(\delta\lambda\right)^{\nu i}\right], \\
\delta_G e_\alpha{}^i &= \mathfrak{L}_\varepsilon e_\alpha{}^i - \varepsilon^\mu\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu}\left(\delta\lambda\right)^{\nu i}, \\
\delta_G \lambda_\alpha{}^i &= \mathfrak{L}_\varepsilon \lambda_\alpha{}^i + 2\mu\theta\varepsilon^\mu\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu}\left[\frac{1}{2\mu\theta}\left(\delta e\right)^{\nu i} - \frac{1}{2\theta}\left(\delta A\right)^{\nu i} + \left(\delta\lambda\right)^{\nu i}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

which are precisely (on-shell) diffeomorphism. Additionally, TMG (1) is also made invariant under Poincaré transformations by construction [46, 47]. Thus, in order to recover the Poincaré symmetry, we need to map the arbitrary gauge parameters of the fundamental gauge symmetry 'δ_G' (60) into those of the Poincaré symmetry. This is achieved by a mapping of the gauge parameters [47–49], e.g.:

$$\zeta^i = A^i{}_\mu\varepsilon^\mu + \omega^i, \qquad \kappa^i = e^i{}_\mu\varepsilon^\mu, \qquad \varsigma^i = \lambda^i{}_\mu\varepsilon^\mu \tag{63}$$

such that ε^μ and ω^i are related to local coordinate translations and local Lorentz rotations, respectively, which together constitute the 6 independent gauge parameters of Poincaré symmetries in 3D. By using this map, the gauge symmetries reproduce the Poincaré symmetries modulo terms proportional to the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_G e_\alpha{}^i &= -\varepsilon^\mu\partial_\mu e_\alpha{}^i - e_\mu{}^i\partial_\alpha\varepsilon^\mu - f^i{}_{jk}e_\alpha{}^j\omega^k + \varepsilon^\gamma\epsilon_{\alpha\gamma\nu}\left(\delta\lambda\right)^{\nu i}, \\
\delta_G A_\alpha{}^i &= -\partial_\alpha\omega^i - f^i{}_{jk}A_\alpha{}^j\omega^k - \varepsilon^\mu\partial_\mu A_\alpha{}^i - A_\mu{}^i\partial_\alpha\varepsilon^\mu - \mu\varepsilon^\gamma\epsilon_{\alpha\gamma\nu}\left[\frac{1}{2\theta}\left(\delta A\right)^{\nu i} + \left(\delta\lambda\right)^{\nu i}\right], \\
\delta_G \lambda_\alpha{}^i &= -\varepsilon^\mu\partial_\mu\lambda_\alpha{}^i - \lambda_\mu{}^i\partial_\alpha\varepsilon^\mu - f^i{}_{jk}\lambda_\alpha{}^j\omega^k - 2\mu\theta\varepsilon^\gamma\epsilon_{\alpha\gamma\nu}\left[\frac{1}{2\mu\theta}\left(\delta e\right)^{\nu i} - \frac{1}{2\theta}\left(\delta A\right)^{\nu i} + \left(\delta\lambda\right)^{\nu i}\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where the equations of motion $(\delta e)^{\nu i}$, $(\delta A)^{\nu i}$ and $(\delta\lambda)^{\nu i}$ are defined in (4)-(6). We thus conclude that the Poincaré symmetry (64) as well as the diffeomorphisms (61) are not independient symmetries:

they are contained in the fundamental gauge symmetry (60) as on-shell symmetries, that is, only when the equations of motion are imposed. In addition, the generators of such gauge transformations can be represented in terms of the zero-modes, thereby making evident that the zero-modes of the symplectic two-form encode all the information about the gauge structure of this theory.

V. THE FADDEEV-JACKIW BRACKETS AND DEGREE OF FREEDOM COUNT

As we previously mentioned in Sec. III, for theories with gauge symmetry the symplectic matrix obtained at the end of the procedure is still singular. Nevertheless, in order to obtain a non-singular symplectic matrix and to determine the quantization bracket (F-J brackets) structure between the dynamical fields, we must to impose a gauge-fixing procedure to the theory, that is, new gauge constraints. In this case, we now partially fix the gauge by imposing the time-gauge, namely, $A^i{}_0 = 0$, $e^i{}_0 = 0$, $\lambda^i{}_0 = 0$ and $\varphi_0 = \text{cte}$ (i.e. $\dot{\varphi}_0 = 0$). In this manner, we also introduce new Lagrange multipliers that enforce these gauge conditions, namely, $\dot{\rho}_i$, $\dot{\omega}_i$, $\dot{\tau}_i$ and $\dot{\sigma}^0$. Then, the final symplectic Lagrangian after gauge fixing can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \epsilon^{ab}\theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu}A_{bi} + 2e_{bi}\right)\dot{A}^i{}_a + \epsilon^{ab}\lambda_{ib}\dot{e}^i{}_a - (\Xi_i - \rho_i)\,\dot{\beta}^i - (\Theta_i - \omega_i)\,\dot{\alpha}^i - (\Sigma_i - \tau_i)\,\dot{\gamma}^i - \left(\Phi^0 - \sigma^0\right)\dot{\varphi}_0. \tag{65}$$

From the Lagrangian density (65) one may read off the final set of symplectic variable

$$\xi^I = \left(A^i{}_a, \beta^i, e^i{}_a, \alpha^i, \lambda^i{}_a, \gamma^i, \varphi^0, \rho^i, \omega^i, \tau^i, \sigma_0\right), \tag{66}$$

so that, the corresponding symplectic 1-form is given by

$$a_I = \left(\epsilon^{ab}\theta\left(\frac{1}{\mu}A_{bi} + 2e_{bi}\right), -\Xi_i + \rho_i, \epsilon^{ab}\lambda_{bi}, -\Theta_i + \omega_i, 0, -\Sigma_i + \tau_i, -\Phi_0 + \sigma_0, 0, 0, 0, 0\right). \tag{67}$$

After some algebra, we obtain the explicit form of the symplectic matrix f_{IJ}

$$\begin{pmatrix}
2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\eta_{ij} & -2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\nabla_{aij} & -2\theta\eta_{ij} & -2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & E_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2\frac{\theta}{\mu}\nabla_{aij} & 0 & 2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & -E_{aij} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2\theta\eta_{ij} & -2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & -2\Lambda E_{aij} & -\eta_{ij} & -D^x_{aij} & -\lambda_{aj} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2\theta\triangle_{aij} & 0 & 2\Lambda E_{aij} & 0 & D^y_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & E_{aij} & \eta_{ij} & -D^x_{aij} & 0 & 0 & -e_{aj} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-E_{aij} & 0 & D^y_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \lambda_{aj} & 0 & e_{aj} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab} \\
0 & \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ab} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}$$
$$\times\epsilon^{ab}\delta^2(x-y) \tag{68}$$

where we can observe that the matrix is not singular. Therefore there exists the inverse ${f_{IJ}}^{-1}$, which can be computed and written formally as

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\frac{\mu}{2\theta}\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mu\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & D^{x}_{aij} & -\frac{\mu}{2\theta}L_{aij} & -\frac{\mu}{2\theta}E_{aij} & \mu e_{ai} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & -E_{aij} & D_{aij} & 0 & e_{ai} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 \\
\mu\eta_{ij} & 0 & -\eta_{ij} & 0 & -2\theta\mu\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & L_{aij} & -\diamondsuit_{aij} & -\nabla_{aij} & -\lambda_{ai} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \eta_{ij} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
-D^{y}_{aij} & -\eta_{ij} & E_{aij} & 0 & -L_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{\mu}{2\theta}L_{aij} & 0 & -D^{y}_{aij} & -\eta_{ij} & \diamondsuit_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\mu}{2\theta}L_{aik}{L_{b}}^{k}{}_{j} & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{\mu}{2\theta}E_{aij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \nabla_{aij} & -\eta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\mu}{2\theta}E_{aik}{E_{b}}^{k}{}_{j} & e^{aj}\nabla_{aij} \\
-\mu e_{ai} & 0 & -e_{ai} & 0 & \lambda_{ai} & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -e^{aj}\nabla_{aij} & 0
\end{array}\right)$$
$$\times\epsilon^{ab}\delta^{2}(x-y), \tag{69}$$

with $\diamondsuit_{aij} = (\mu L_{aij} + 2\Lambda E_{aij})$. In this way, the quantization brackets, dubbed generalized Faddeev-Jackiw bracket, $\{,\}_{F-J}$ between two elements of the symplectic variable set (66), is defined as

$$\{\xi_I(x), \xi_J(y)\}_{F-J} \equiv (f_{IJ})^{-1}. \tag{70}$$

The non-vanishing Faddeev-Jackiw brackets for topologically massive AdS gravity can now be easily extracted using (69) and (70). We thus have

$$\{{A^{i}}_{a}(x), {A^{j}}_{b}(y)\}_{F-J} = \frac{\mu}{2\theta}\eta^{ij}\delta^{2}(x-y), \tag{71}$$

$$\{{A^{i}}_{a}(x), {\lambda^{j}}_{b}(y)\}_{F-J} = -\mu\epsilon_{ab}\eta^{ij}\delta^{2}(x-y), \tag{72}$$

$$\{{\lambda^{i}}_{a}(x), {\lambda^{j}}_{b}(y)\}_{F-J} = 2\theta\mu\epsilon_{ab}\eta^{ij}\delta^{2}(x-y), \tag{73}$$

$$\{{e^{i}}_{a}(x), {\lambda^{j}}_{b}(y)\}_{F-J} = \epsilon_{ab}\eta^{ij}\delta^{2}(x-y). \tag{74}$$

These F-J brackets correspond to the Dirac brackets reported in [31]. The canonical quantization $\left(\{\xi_I, \xi_J\}_{F-J} \to \frac{1}{i\hbar}\left[\hat{\xi}_I, \hat{\xi}_J\right]\right)$ can be carried out by using the aforementioned brackets given by (71)-(74). In addition, we are now ready to perform the counting the number of physical degrees of freedom: starting with 18 canonical variables $({e^{i}}_{a}, {\lambda^{i}}_{a}, {A^{i}}_{a})$, we end up with 17 independent constraints $(\Xi^{(0)}_{i}, \Theta^{(0)}_{i}, \Sigma^{(0)}_{i}, \Phi^{0}, {e^{i}}_{0} = 0, {A^{i}}_{0} = 0, \varphi_0 = \text{cte})$ after imposing the gauge-fixing term. Therefore, the number of physical degrees of freedom per space point for 3D Topologically Massive AdS Gravity is one, independently of the value of μ, as claimed in [33, 34].

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

In the present paper, the nature of constraints and gauge structure in the topologically massive AdS gravity theory from the perspective of the Faddeev-Jackiw symplectic approach was studied.

The whole set of independent physical constraints in the theory was identified through the consistency condition and the zero-modes. Thereafter, it was shown that once all the physical constraints are found but the symplectic matrix still has zero-modes, that is, when the zero-modes are orthogonal to the gradient of the symplectic potential on the surface of the constraints, one can deduce that the theory has a local gauge symmetry, and therefore, the zero-modes (55)-(57) readily generate the local gauge symmetry under which all physical quantities are invariant. By mapping the gauge parameters appropriately we have also obtained the Poincaré transformations and the diffeomorphisms symmetry. Additionally, we have shown that the time-gauge fixing of the density Lagrangian (50) renders the non-degenerate symplectic matrix f_{IJ}, then we have identified the quantizaion bracket (F-J brackets) structure and we have proved that the physical degrees of freedom is one. It is important to comment that all results presented along this paper can be applied for studying the physical content of models such as massive gravity and bigravity theories in 2+1 dimensions, in which secondary, tertiary, or higher order constraints are present. These problems are currently being considered [52]. Another line for further research is the natural application of the procedure used here to explore conceptual and technical issues of gravity models in 3+1 dimensions.

Acknowledgements

This work has been partially supported by CONACyT under grand number CB-2014-01/240781. We would like to thank G. Tavares-Velasco for reading a draft version of this paper and alerting us to various typos.

---

[1] Supernova Search Team Collaboration, A. G. Riess et. al., *Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant*, *Astron.J.* **116** (1998) 10091038.

[2] R. Durrer and R. Maartens, *Dark Energy and Dark Gravity*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40** (2008) 301328.

[3] D. Lovelock, *The Einstein tensor and its generalizations*, *J. Math. Phys.* **12** (1971) 498501.

[4] D. Lovelock, *The four-dimensionality of space and the einstein tensor*, *J. Math. Phys.* **13** (1972) 874-867.

[5] V.A. Rubakov and P.G. Tinyakov, *Infrared-modified gravities and massive gravitons*, *Phys. Usp.* **51** (2008) 759.

[6] M. Fierz and W. Pauli, *On relativistic wave equation for paticles of arbitrary spin in an electromagnetic field*, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lon.* **A 173** (1939) 211-232.

[7] W. Pauli and M. Fierz, *On Relativistic Field Equations of Particles With Arbitrary Spin in an Electromagnetic Field*, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **12** (1939) 297300.

[8] C. de Rham and G. Gabadadze, *Generalization of the Fierz-Pauli action*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 82** (2010) 044020.

[9] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A.J. Tolley, *Resummation of massive gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **Lett. 106**

(2011) 231101

[10] S. Hassan and R.A. Rosen, *Resolving the ghost problem in non-linear massive gravity*, arXiv:1106.3344 [INSPIRE].

[11] C. de Rham, *Massive Gravity*, *Living Rev. Rel* **17** (2014) 7.

[12] K. Hinterbichler and R. A. Rosen, *Interacting Spin-2 Fields*, *JHEP* **07** (2012) 047.

[13] K. Hinterbichler, *Theoretical Aspects of Massive Gravity*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84** (2012) 671.

[14] Hamid R. Afshar, Eric A. Bergshoeff and Wout Merbis, *Interacting spin-2 fields in three dimensions*, *JHEP* **01** (2015) 040.

[15] D. Boulware and S. Deser, *Can gravity have a finite range?*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 6** (1972) 3368.

[16] C. Deffayet, J. Mourad and G. Zahariade, *Covariant Constraints in ghost free massive gravity*, *JCAP* **01** (2013) 032.

[17] P. Creminelli, A. Nicolis, M. Papucci and E. Trincherini, *Ghost in massive gravity*, *JHEP* **09** (205) 003.

[18] K.S. Stelle, *Phys. Rev.* **D16**, 953 (1977)

[19] S. Deser and Z. Yang, *Is topologically massive gravity renormalizable?*, *Classical Quantum gravity* **7**, 1603 (1990).

[20] B. Keszthelyi and G. Kleppe, *Renormalizability of D=3 topologically massive gravity, Phys. Lett* **B 281**, 33 (1992)

[21] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, *Topologically Massive Gauge Theories*, Annals Phys. 140 (1982) 372 [Annals Phys. 281 (2000) 409] [Annals Phys. 185 (1988) 406] [INSPIRE].

[22] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and G. 't Hooft, *Three-dimensional Einstein gravity: Dynamical of flat space*, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) 152, 220 (1984)

[23] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and G. 't Hooft, *Three-dimensional cosmological gravity: Dynamical of constant curvature*, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) 153, 405 (1984)

[24] E. Witten, *(2+1)-dimensional gravity as an exactly soluble system*, Nucl. Phys. B311, 46 (1988)

[25] W. Li, W. Song, A. Strominger, *Chiral gravity in three dimensions. JHEP* **0804**, 082 (2008)

[26] S. S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, *Three-Dimensional Massive Gauge Theories*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 975 [INSPIRE].

[27] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures Notes on Quantum Mechanics*, Yeshiva University, New York, NY (1964).

[28] T. Hanson, A., Egge and C. Teitelboim, *Constraints Hamiltonian Systems*, Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei **1978**.

[29] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*, Princeton, New Jersey:Princeton University Press **1991**.

[30] L. Castellani, *Symmetries in the contrained Hamiltonian system ,Ann. Phys.* **143** (1982) 357.

[31] M. Blagojevic and B. Cvetkovic, *Canonical structure of topologically massive gravity with a cosmological constant*, *JHEP* **05** (2009) 073.

[32] Mu-In Park, *Constraint Dynamics and Gravitons in Three Dimensions*, *JHEP* **0809** (2008) 084.

[33] S. Carlip, *Constraint Algebra of Topologically Massive AdS Gravity*, *JHEP* **0810** (2008) 078.

[34] D. Grumiller, R. Jackiw and N. Johansson, *Canonical analysis of cosmological topologically massive gravity at the chiral point*, **MIT-CTP 3957, UUITP-12/08**, (2008).

[35] L. D. Faddeev and R. Jackiw, *Hamiltonian Reduction of Unconstrained and Constrained Systems*, *Phys. Rev.* **Lett 60**(1988) , 1692.

[36] Barcelos-Neto, J. et al., *Symplectic quantization of constrained systems*, *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A 7** (1992) 1737.

[37] J. Barcelos-Neto, C. Wotzasek, *Faddeev-Jackiw quantization and constraints*, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A 7** (1992) 4981.

[38] H.Montani and R. Montemayor, *Lagrangian approach to a symplectic formalism for singular systems*, *Phys. Rev.* **D 58** (1998) 125018.

[39] H. Montani and C. Wotzasek, *Faddeev-Jackiw quantization of nonabelian systems*, *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A 8** (1993) 3387.

[40] J.Antonio Garcia, Josep M. Pons *Equivalence of Faddeev-Jackiw and Dirac approaches for gauge theories*, *Int.J.Mod.Phys.* **A12** (1997) 451.

[41] Leng Liao, Yong Chang Huang, *Non-equivalence of Faddeev-Jackiw method and Dirac-Bergmann algorithm and the modification of Faddeev-Jackiw method for keeping the equivalence*, *Annals of Physics* **322** (2007) 2469.

[42] E.M.C. Abreu, A.C.R. Mendes, C. Neves, W. Oliveira, R.C.N: Silva and C. Wotzasek, *Obtaining non-Abelian field theories via the Faddeev-Jackiw symplectic formalism*, *Phys.Lett.* **A 375** (2010) 3603.

[43] Wotzasek, Clovis, *Faddeev-Jackiw approach to hidden symmetries*, *Annals Phys.* **243** (1995) 73.

[44] S. Carlip, *Inducing Liouville theory from topologically massive gravity*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 362** (1991) 111-124.

[45] S. Carlip, S. Deser, A. Waldron, and Wise, D. K., *Cosmological Topologically Massive Gravitons and Photons*, *class. Quantum Grav* **26** (2009) 075008.

[46] R. Utiyama, *Invariant theoretical interpretation of interaction*, *Phys. Rev.* **101** (1956) 1597.

[47] T. W. B. Kibble, *Lorentz invariance and the gravitational field*, *J. Math. Phys* **2**, 212 (1961)

[48] R. Banerjee, S. Gangopadhyay, P. Mukherjee and D. Roy, *Symmetries of the general topologically massive gravity in the hamiltonian and lagrangian formalisms, JHEP* **1002**, 075 (2010).

[49] M. Blagojevic, *Gravitation and Gauge Symmetries*, (IOP, *Bristol, United Kingdom, 2002*).

[50] D. J. Toms, *Faddeev-Jackiw quantization and the path integral*, *Phys. Rev* **D 92** 105026 (2015).

[51] A. Fuster, Marc Henneaux and Axel. Maas, *BRST quantization: A Short review*, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* **2**, 939-964 (2005).

[52] Omar Rodríguez-Tzompantzi, *in preparation.*